<div align="center">**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**</div>

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for a telephone call on July 11, 2006 between the Examiner and the Applicant's undersigned representative.

Claims 1-10 and 12-21 are pending in this Application. Claims 1, 8, and 15 have been amended. Claims 1-10 and 12-21 remain pending in the Application after entry of this Amendment. No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the disclosure as containing informalities needing appropriate correction. The Examiner rejected claims 1-10, and 12-21 on the grounds of statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,983,381 (hereinafter the "'381 patent"). The Examiner rejected claims 1-10, and 12-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-10, and 12-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,952,781 to Chang et al. (hereinafter "Chang"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,148,404 to Yatsukawa et al. (hereinafter "Yatsukawa"), and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,732,269 to Baskey et al. (hereinafter "Baskey"). The Examiner further rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang, in view of Yatsukawa, in further view of Baskey, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,782,103 to Arthan et al. (hereinafter "Arthan").

Specification Objections

Applicant respectfully traverses the objections to the disclosure and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections. In the Office Action, the Examiner makes the allegation that the Application appears to be a divisional of U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60/262,875, filed Jan. 17, 2001, and requests language to be added to the disclosure identifying the Application as a divisional application of a provisional application. Applicant, however, points the Examiner's attention to 35 U.S.C. § 119 Benefit of earlier filing date; right

of priority, 37 C.F.R. § 1.78 Claiming benefit of earlier filing date and cross-references to other applications; and M.P.E.P. § 201.11 Claiming the Benefit of an Earlier Filing Date Under 35 U.S.C. 120 and 119(e). In particular, M.P.E.P. § 201.11(III)(B), second paragraph, states:

> The relationship (i.e., continuation, divisional, or continuation-in-part) is _not_ required and should not be specified when a prior provisional application is being claimed under 35 U.S.C. 119(e). No relationship should be specified because whenever a priority claim to a provisional application under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) is made, it is implicit that the relationship is "nonprovisional application of a provisional application." (Emphasis added).

In response, however, Applicant has amended the disclosure to include a cross-reference to related applications that also claim priority to the U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60/262,875. Therefore, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections.

Double Patenting Rejections

In the Office Action, the Examiner quotes M.P.E.P. § 804 ¶ 8.33 Basis for Nonstatutory Double Patenting. However, the Examiner in paragraph 7 of the Office Action rejected claims 1-10 and 12-21 on the grounds of statutory obviousness-type double patenting in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,983,381 (hereinafter the "'381 patent"). In the telephone call of July 11, 2006, the Examiner clarified the double patenting rejection as nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting. Applicant is willing to consider filing a terminal disclaimer once all pending claims are indicated as otherwise allowable.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner rejected claims 1-10, and 12-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner states that the phrase "first communications channel" is indefinite because the word "first" is not followed by the words "second" or "next" communication channel.

In response, Applicant has amended claims 1, 8, and 15 to remove the word "first." Applicant thanks the Examiner for her helpful suggestion. Therefore, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the corresponding rejections.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections based on Chang, Yatsukawa, and Baskey. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-10, and 12-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang, in view of Yatsukawa, and in further view of Baskey. The Examiner makes the allegation that the combination of references teach or disclose all of the claimed limitations of the corresponding claims and that one having ordinary skill in that art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to incorporate the teachings of Chang with the teachings of Yatsukawa and Baskey.

Applicant further respectfully traverses the rejections and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections based on Chang, Yatsukawa, Baskey, and Arthan. The Examiner rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang, in view of Yatsukawa, in further view of Baskey, and in further view of Arthan.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has not established a prima facie case of obviousness in the Office Action. To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference, or references when combined, must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations.

Applicant submits that Chang, Yatsukawa, and Baskey, either individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least one of the claimed limitations from each of the

Appl. No. 09/896,163
Amdt. dated July 14, 2006
Reply to Office Action of April 14, 2006

PATENT

corresponding claims 1-4, 6-10, and 12-21. Applicants further submit that Chang, Yatsukawa, Baskey, and Arthan, either individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least one of the claimed limitations from the corresponding claim 5.

Claim 1

Claim 1 is directed to a computer program product for a client computing system including a processor. As recited in claim 1, the computer program product includes codes residing on a tangible media. The codes direct the processor to perform various operations recited in claim 1. As recited in claim 1, the processor requests a challenge from an authentication server. As recited in claim 1, the processor receives the challenge from the authentication server via a secure communications channel. The challenge recited in claim 1 includes a password that is inactive. As recited in claim 1, the processor receives user authentication data from a user. As recited in claim 1, the processor determines a private key and a digital certificate in response to the user authentication data.

As further recited in claim 1, the processor forms a digital signature in response to the password that is inactive from the authentication server and the private key. As recited in claim 1, the processor communicates the digital signature to the authentication server. As recited in claim 1, the processor communicates the digital certificate to the authentication server. The digital certificate recited in claim 1 includes a public key in an encrypted form. As recited in claim 1, the processor communicates network user authentication data and the password that is inactive to the authentication server via a security server. The authentication server recited in claim 1 then activates the password that is inactive when the digital signature is verified.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assertions that claim 1 is made obvious by the combination of Chang, Yatsukawa, and Baskey.

Chang discloses techniques for establishing a plurality of sessions between a client and a server based on a single input of user authentication information. In Chang, an authentication server receives a request including identification information from the client to

establish a connection between the client and the server. If it is determined that the connection

between the client and the server should be established, the authentication server caches the

identification information in memory and the connection is allowed. Subsequent connection

requests from the client to the server may be established based on the cached identification

information without further input from the client or user. (Chang: Abstract).

Applicant submits that Chang does not teach or suggest receiving a challenge

from an authentication server as recited in claim 1, where the challenge includes a password that

is inactive. Applicant further submits that Change does not teach or suggest activating the

password as recited in claim 1. Instead, Chang merely discloses communicating user

identification information from a client system to an AAA server. (Chang: FIG. 3, element 304).

In Chang, a token card generates a series of random one-time passwords (OTPs). (Chang: Col.

2, lines 15-20). The token card works in conjunction with a password server that independently

generates OTPs in synch with the token card. (Chang: Col. 2, lines 32-33). The user-entered

OTP of Chang is sent to the password server and then compared to an OTP independently

generated in the password server. Thus, in Chang, the OTP generated by the password server is

not provided to the user. Instead, the user provides the OTP generated by the token card to the

password server. Additionally, nowhere does Chang disclose that the user-submitted OTP or the

OTP generated by the password server are activated after being inactive as recited in claim 1.

Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's assertion that Table 2 of Chang discloses

receiving a challenge from an authentication server as recited in claim 1, where the challenge

includes a password that is inactive. Table 2 of Chang illustrates steps take by a client and AAA

server to result in the expiration of user identification information due to the expiration of a

cache time-out value. At each of the times 0, 2, and 65 in Table 2 of Chang, the user JOE

supplies the OTP from a hand-held card to an AAA server in a request to establish a session.

The user supplying the OTP from the hand-held card and the CHAP password in Chang does not

teach or suggest receiving a challenge from an authentication server as recited in claim 1, where

the challenge includes a password that is inactive.

Applicant further disagrees with the Examiner's allegation that Table 2 of Chang discloses the authentication server activates the password as recited in claim 1. Chang merely discloses that if the user JOE desires to establish another session within the cache time-out value period, the user JOE sends the AAA server the previously used OTP. The AAA server then compares the previously submitted OTP to the cached OTP at time 2 in Table 2 of Chang. Outside of the cache time-out value, the AAA server sends the user-submitted OTP to the token server for verification. Applicant submits that Chang does not teach or suggest that an authentication server activates the password as recited in claim 1.

Moreover, due to the nature of one-time passwords, any OTP submitted by the user JOE in Chang is invalid for use with the token server in subsequent authentications after a first successful authentication (see Chang: Col. 2, lines 15-28). Instead, in Chang, the previously used OTP is cached by the AAA server to allow for establishing subsequent connections using the expired OTP. Nowhere does Chang disclose that the AAA server or the token server activates the previously used OTP.

In the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges that Chang does not teach or suggest the features of determining a private key and a digital certificate, communicating the digital certificate, and a secure communication channel as recited in claim 1. The Examiner relies on Yatsukawa to teach the features of determining a private key and a digital certificate and communicating the digital certificate as recited in claim 1. The Examiner relies on Baskey to teach the feature of a secure communication channel as recited in claim 1. However, Applicant submits that Yatsukawa and Baskey fail to cure the deficiencies of Chang.

Applicant submits that Yatsukawa does not supply the missing claim limitation of receiving a challenge from an authentication server as recited in claim 1, where the challenge includes a password that is inactive. Not all limitations of claim 1 can be found in the combination of Chang and Yatsukawa. As discussed in previous responses, Yatsukawa discloses that a client generates authentication data D by enciphering the seed data Ds0 stored at the client (e.g., in the storage medium) by the client private key K, and then authentication data D is sent to

Appl. No. 09/896,163
Amdt. dated July 14, 2006
Reply to Office Action of April 14, 2006

PATENT

the server. (Yatsukawa: Col. 16, lines 57-60). Additionally, Ds0 determined in the authentication server in Yatsukawa is not inactive and then activated, but once determined, is always active. Thus, Applicant submits that Yatsukawa does not teach or suggest receiving a challenge from an authentication server as recited in claim 1, where the challenge includes a password that is inactive. Applicant further submits that Yatsukawa does not teach or suggest activating the password as recited in claim 1.

Applicant further submits that Baskey does not supply the missing claim limitation of receiving a challenge from an authentication server as recited in claim 1, where the challenge includes a password that is inactive. As the Examiner relies on Baskey in the Office Action to teach SSL communications, nowhere has the Examiner pointed to where Baskey teaches receiving a challenge from an authentication server as recited in claim 1, where the challenge includes a password that is inactive. Applicant further submits that Baskey does not teach or suggest activating the password as recited in claim 1.

In light of the above, Applicant submits that the combination of Chang, Yatsukawa, and Baskey do not teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations recited in claim 1. Thus, Applicants submits that claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-4, 6-10, and 12-21

Applicant submits that independent claims 8 and 15 are allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of claim 1. Applicant further submits that dependent claims 2-4, 6-7, 9-10, 12-14, and 16-21 are allowable for being dependent on independent claims containing allowable subject matter. Applicant further submits that the dependent claims are allowable for additional reasons as the dependent claims recite features not found in the independent claims.

Claim 5

Applicant submits that dependent claim 5 is allowable for being dependent on allowable independent claim 1. In the Office Action, the Examiner relies on Arthan to teach changing a private key when authentication is incorrect. However, Applicant submits that Arthan does not cure the deficiencies of Chang, Yatsukawa, and Baskey.

Applicant submits that Arthan does not supply the missing claim limitation of receiving a challenge from an authentication server as recited in the independent claim 1, where the challenge includes a password that is inactive. Not all limitations of claim 5, which depends from claim 1, can be found in the combination of Chang, Yatsukawa, Baskey, and Arthan. Therefore, while the Examiner relies on Arthan to teach changing a private key when authentication is incorrect, Arthan does not teach or suggest receiving a challenge from an authentication server as recited in the independent claim 1, where the challenge includes a password that is inactive. Thus, the combination of Chang, Yatsukawa, Baskey, and Arthan does not teach or suggest claim 1. As dependent claim 5 dependents from claim 1, Applicant submits that claim 5 is allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant believes all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean F. Parmenter/

Sean F. Parmenter
Reg. No. 53,437

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 650-326-2422
SFP:am
60757236 v1